

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 16, 20, 21, and 30-33 are currently pending.
- Claims 16, 30, and 32 are amended herein.

Support for the amendments to the claims is found in the specification, as originally filed, at least at page 13, lines 9-19. The amendments submitted herein do not introduce any new matter.

## **Cited Documents**

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Dudkiewicz:** Dudkiewicz, Gil G., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0177370;
- **Florence:** Florence, Michael, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0188948; and
- **Goddard:** Goddard, Mark D., U.S. Patent No. 6,684,240.

## **Claims 16, 20, 21, 30, 31, and 33 are Non-Obvious Over Dudkiewicz in view of Florence and Goddard**

Claims 16, 20, 21, 30, 31, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Dudkiewicz in view of Florence and Goddard. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

Independent Claim 16

Claim 16, as amended herein, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

...identifying the requested configuration information associated with the client device based on the received identifier, ***wherein the requested configuration information is a single set of household configuration information that is applied to and shared by the plurality of client devices in the household, the household configuration information providing a default configuration for the client devices...***

In rejecting claim 16, the Examiner cites parts of Dudkiewicz and Florence as teaching the claimed household configuration information. According to the Examiner, Dudkiewicz describes viewer profile information of a plurality of viewers (Dudkiewicz, Fig. 1 and paragraph [0025]). The Examiner notes that multiple viewers in a household might have the same profile information and thus be said to share that information (see page 3 of the rejection). The Examiner also cites Fig. 8 and paragraph [0060] of Florence as teaching that each of multiple viewer profiles may be associated with a different client device.

In response, Applicant first notes that the “sharing” described by the Examiner is not what one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the claimed “sharing” as referring to. The Examiner states that the viewer profiles for multiple household members may indicate that the members are Colt fans (see page 3 of rejection). Applicant submits that, even if Dudkiewicz does suggest common content among viewer profiles, this is not the same as sharing information. To illustrate Applicant's contention, here is an example. If both Jack and Jill have a copy of a new bestselling book, we would not say that they share this book. Rather, each person has their own

copy of the book. For the bestseller to be shared, there would need to be one copy passed between Jack and Jill. Likewise, in Dudkiewicz, each viewer has her own viewer profile. Even where profiles have common content, that content is not shared. Each viewer retrieves a separate profile that is used and updated without reference to any other profile. Simply put, the arrangement of Dudkiewicz is not sharing.

Despite Applicant's disagreement with the rejection, Applicant offers amendments to claim 16 herein to further clarify the distinctions between the claimed subject matter and cited documents. The amended claim now says that the household configuration information is a "single set" and that it is "applied to" each of the multiple client devices. As can be seen from the argument above, the cited documents teach multiple viewer profiles each separately applied for a viewer, not a single set of information applied to multiple devices.

Also, the amended claim now recites that the "household configuration information providing a default configuration for the client devices." The cited documents, however, make no mention of a single set of information that provides a default configuration for multiple client devices.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combined cited documents do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 16.

### Independent Claim 30

Claim 30 is patentable over the cited documents at least for reasons similar to those given above with regard to claim 16.

**Dependent Claims 20, 21, 31, and 33**

Claims 20, 21, 31, and 33 each ultimately depend from one of independent claims 16, 30, and 32. As discussed above, claims 16, 30, and 32 are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 20, 21, 31, and 33 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 20, 21, 31, and 33.

**Claim 32 is Non-Obvious Over Dudkiewicz in view of Florence**

Claim 32 is patentable over the cited documents at least for reasons similar to those given above with regard to claim 16.

## **Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck, Reg. No. 56826/

Dated: Oct. 19, 2010

Robert C. Peck  
(robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)  
Registration No. 56826

Colin D. Barnitz  
Registration No. 35061